TRANSPORT REPRESENTATION OF TR

PTO/SB/21 (08-00)
Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

Application Number	09/387,443	
Filing Date	September 1, 1999	
First Named Inventor	William Kopaciewicz	
Group Art Unit	1723	
Examiner Name	Fortuna, A.	
Attorney Docket Number	550P002Cont.2	

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)			
Fee Transmittal Form	Assignment Papers (for an Application)	After Allowance Communication to Group	
Fee Attached	Drawing(s)	Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences	
X Amendment / Reply	Licensing-related Papers	Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)	
After Final	Petition	Proprietary Information	
Affidavits/declaration(s)	Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application	Status Letter	
Extension of Time Request	Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address Terminal Disclaimer	Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):	
Express Abandonment Request	Request for Refund		
Information Disclosure Statement	CD, Number of CD(s)	TC 17	
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	Remarks		
Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application		HAII HAII	
Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53		ECEIVED IUN 14 2091 00 MAIL ROOM	
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT			
Firm Kevin S. Nields & Signature	Lemack		
Date June 8, 2	001		
CERTIFICATE OF MAILING			

Typed or printed name Keyin & Lemack
Signature Date June 8, 2001

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class

mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231 on this date:

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

June 8, 2001



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant

William Kopaciewicz, et al.

Serial No.

09/387,443

Filed

September 1, 1999

For

CAST MEMBRANE STRUCTURES FOR SAMPLE PREPARATION

Examiner

Fortuna, A.

Art Unit

1723

Attorney

Docket No.

550P002Cont.2

Assistant Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

3001 Name of applicant assignee, or Registered

I hereby certify that this correspondence

is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents

and Trademarks, Washington, D. C. 20231,

10 6.21.01+

Representativo

Signature

REMARKS

The Office Action dated May 17, 2001 has been received and carefully studied.

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9-12 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Mehl Ehrenfried, et al., WO 98/08594 and EP 0 826 412). The Examiner states that the '594 reference discloses providing microporous elements or membranes having adsorptive particle and provided at the end of a tubular housing or pipette, and that the polymer having bound adsorbtion particles is provided continuous to the second open end of the housing or pipette. The Examiner also states that the '412 reference discloses the pipette having the membrane with adsorptive particles and a process for providing the membrane at the tip or end, as well as treated or derivatized silica particles or adsorptive particles. The Examiner also rejects claims 3, 7, 8, 13, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mehl Ehrenfried et al., and further in view of Kulprathipanja et al.

The rejections are respectfully traversed.

BEST AVAILABL

Neither WO 98/08594, published on March 5, 1998, nor EP 0 826 412, published on March 4, 1998 is a reference against the present case. Indeed, 35 U.S.C. §102(e) relates solely to U.S. Patents as references; it is improper as a matter of law to apply this section of the statute to foreign documents.

The Examiner is apparently making a "hypothetical" rejection in order to provide applicant an opportunity to amend, since a corresponding U.S. patent may issue. Applicants respectfully submit that an amendment would be premature, since (1) Applicants have no access to the pending U.S. corresponding case and therefore cannot evaluate its content or its filing date; and (2) the pending corresponding U.S. case may never issue as a patent.

In view of the foregoing, it appears that resuspension is the only proper action at this time.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin S. Lemack

Reg. No. 32,579

176 E. Main Street - Suite 8 Westboro, Massachusetts 01581

TEL: (508) 898-1818